

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 and 18-31 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 6-11, 16, 18-27 and 31 are amended. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Nasri at the interview held August 15, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

I. Claim Amendments

Claims 1-3, 6-11, 16, 18-27 and 31 are amended. Examiner Nasri asserted during the personal interview that "convex part" and "optical waveguide part" can be construed broadly to be interpreted as "part" of the convex and "part" of the optical waveguide. However, Applicants believe that one of ordinary skill in the art would interpret "part" to be a member of the optical waveguide, and not a portion of the optical waveguide or of the convex, as this construction of "part" is supported in the specification at paragraph [0080]. See, e.g., paragraph [0080].

Although Applicants do not believe such claim amendments are necessary, the claims are amended to expedite prosecution and the amendments are thus not narrowing.

II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 16, 18-26 and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,065,881 to Okada et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 16, 18-26 and 28-31 are not anticipated by Okada. As agreed upon during the personal interview, Okada does not disclose "an optical waveguide member being provided solely on the convex member," as recited in independent claim 16, and as similarly recited in claims 26 and 31.

As agreed upon during the personal interview, Okada as shown in Fig. 8, discloses an optical transmission line 40 that is formed on the first optical transmission terminal 21 and the second optical transmission terminal 22. See, e.g., Okada, col. 16, lines 21-46, and col. 17, lines 32-41; and Fig. 8. Thus, because the optical transmission line of Okada is provided on both the first optical transmission terminal 21 and the second optical transmission terminal 22, Okada does not disclose the optical waveguide member being formed solely on the convex member.

Thus, claims 16, 26 and 31 are patentable over Okada for at least the reasons discussed. Further, claims 18-25 and 20-30, which variously depend from claims 16 and 26, are also patentable over Okada for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claims 16 and 26, as well as the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

A. Claims 1-15 and 27

The Office Action rejects claims 1-15 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Okada. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed upon during the personal interview, Okada does not teach or suggest "the entire optical waveguide member being formed solely along the convex member," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 9.

As discussed above, Okada, instead, discloses an optical transmission line 40 that is formed on both the optical transmission terminal 21 and the second optical transmission terminal 22.

Thus, claims 1 and 9 are patentable over Okada for at least the reasons discussed. Further, claims 2-8, 10-15 and 27, which variously depend from claims 1, 9 and 26, are also patentable over Okada for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1, 9 and 26, as well as the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/djb

Date: October 3, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461